



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,601	02/22/2002	Satoshi Nakajima	41020.P006	5731

25943 7590 11/02/2005

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

DOAN, DUYEN MY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,601

Applicant(s)

NAKAJIMA, SATOSHI

Examiner

Duyen M. Doan

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detail Action

Claims 1-40 are amended.

The submitted affidavits are acknowledged, however they are not considered as a part of the original specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-15, 18-20, 21-23, 25-26, 27-34, 35, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reyna et al (us 2002/0059565) (hereinafter Reyna) in view of Burgin et al (us 2003/0046349) (hereinafter Burgin).

As regarding claim 1, Reyna disclosed processing by a computing device a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface display rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28); Reyna did not expressly disclose generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface display including one or more specifications corresponding specifying the one or more user interface displays, enable

Art Unit: 2143

viewing of said contents of said binary file without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications

Burgin taught generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface display including one or more specifications corresponding specifying the one or more user interface displays (see Burgin, pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41), enable viewing of said contents of said binary file without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications (see Burgin, pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burgin to the method of Reyna because by creating a self-contained objects would make the exchange of electronic message easier for the sender and the receiver (see Burgin pg.1, par 11).

As regarding claim 2, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each specification included one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface display specified by one or more other specification (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 3, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface display enter a particular user interface display state (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 5, Reyna-Burgin disclosed attaching by said computing device said self-contained representation to the electronic message (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 5.

As regarding claim 6, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each of said user interface display comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cell specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 7, Reyna disclosed identifying by a computing device a source format of binary file generated by a source application (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28); selecting by the computing device a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28). Reyna did not expressly disclosed processing by the computing device the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications to enable viewing of the user interface display without the source application.

Burgin taught processing by the computing device the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when

Art Unit: 2143

contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications to enable viewing of the user interface display without the source application (see Burgin, pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burgin to the method of Reyna because by creating a self-contained objects would make the exchange of electronic message easier for the sender and the receiver (see Burgin pg.1, par 11).

As regarding claim 8, Reyna-Burgin disclosed attaching by the computing device said self-contained representation with an electronic message; and transmitting by the computing device said electronic message and said attached self-contained representation to one or more recipients for viewing, where the viewing including rendering said user interface displays in accordance with said user interface display specification and user inputs (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41). The same motivation was utilized in claim 7 applied equally well to claim 8.

As regarding claim 9, Reyna-Burgin disclosed binary file is either a word processing document or a spreadsheet document (see Burgin Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41, Burgin taught transmitting self contained graphic object over communication network, it is obvious to use other type of data beside the graphic data).

As regarding claim 10, Reyna-Burgin disclosed determining is based upon a filename extension associated with said binary file (Reyna pg.2, par 17).

Art Unit: 2143

As regarding claim 11, Reyna-Burgin disclosed launching by the computing device a locally accessible version of application; simulating by the computing device user inputs to said application based at least in part upon said selected set of user interface display specification; and storing by the computing device outputs from said application in response to said user inputs (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41). The same motivation was utilized in claim 7 applied equally well to claim 11.

As regarding claim 12, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other specifications (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 13, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface display enter a particular user interface display state (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 14, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each of said user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cells specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 15, Reyna disclosed selecting by the computing device a set of one or more user interface display specification from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one

Art Unit: 2143

or more supported source application (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28); launching by the computing device a locally accessible version of associated source application (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28); simulating by the computing device one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28); and capturing by the computing device output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals (see Reyna pg.1, par 7; pg.2, par 14-15, 17,19,22; pg.3, par 24-28).

Reyna did not expressly disclose receiving by a computing device an email message including an associated first attachment of a first type; determining by the computing device whether said first attachment type is associated with a member of a group of one or more supported source applications; associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specification to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application.

Burgin taught receiving by a computing device an email message including an associated first attachment of a first type (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41); determining by the computing device whether said first attachment type is associated with a member of a group of one or more supported source applications (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41); associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specification to generate a self-contained representation of

Art Unit: 2143

said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application (see Burgin pg.2-3, par 25-26, 34-41).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burgin to the method of Reyna because by creating a self-contained objects would make the exchange of electronic message easier for the sender and the receiver (see Burgin pg.1, par 11).

As regarding claim 18, Reyna-Burgin disclosed first attachment type comprises a proprietary format (see Reyna pg.2, par 17).

As regarding claim 19, Reyna-Burgin disclosed each of said plurality of user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said user interface display specification comprises one or more display cell specifications (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claim 20, Reyna-Burgin disclosed one or more transition rules, each transition rule specifying a transition to a user interface display when the user interface displays enter a particular display state (see Reyna pg.3, par 25-28).

As regarding claims 21-23, the limitations are similar to claims 1-3, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 1-3.

As regarding claims 25-26, the limitations are similar to claims 5-6, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 5-6.

As regarding claims 27-34, the limitations are similar to claims 7-14, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 7-14.

Art Unit: 2143

As regarding claims 35, the limitations are similar to claims 15, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 15.

As regarding claims 38-40, the limitations are similar to claims 18-20, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 18-20.

Claims 4, 16, 17, 24, 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reyna et al (us 2002/0059565) (hereinafter Reyna) and Burgin et al (us 2003/0046349) (hereinafter Burgin) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Venkatraman et al (us pat 6014688) (hereinafter Venkatraman)

As regarding claim 4, Reyna and Burgin taught all limitations of claim 1 above but did not expressly disclose encoding by the computing device an electronic message having said self-contained representation attached, using a MIME protocol, a Uuencode protocol, or BinHex protocol; transmitting by the computing device said encoded electronic message and self contained representation to one or more addressed recipients.

Venkatraman taught encoding by the computing device an electronic message having said self-contained representation attached, using a MIME protocol, a Uuencode protocol, or BinHex protocol; transmitting by the computing device said encoded electronic message and self contained representation to one or more addressed recipients (col.7, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Venkatraman to the method of Reyna-

Art Unit: 2143

Burgin to have encode the message in MIME, or Uuencode, or BinHex because using MIME, or Uuencode or BinHex would allow the recipient view the attached file regardless of the recipient email platform (see Venkatraman col.2, lines 15-16).

As regarding claim 16, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

As regarding claim 17, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

As regarding claim 36, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

As regarding claim 37, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

As regarding claim 24, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

See the above office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100